

25X1A



THE UNITED STATES GOAL IN TOMORROW'S WORLD

25X1A

25X1A

OWN TO CIA LIBRARY

APR 18 2 40 PM '49

EE/USSR

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

Publication 3450

General Foreign Policy Series 6

Reprinted from the **DEPARTMENT OF STATE BULLETIN** of February 27, 1949

DIVISION OF PUBLICATIONS

OFFICE OF PUBLIC AFFAIRS

The United States Goal in Tomorrow's World

By Ambassador Philip C. Jessup¹

I am grateful for this opportunity to come here to discuss American foreign policy with you leaders who have come to the National Farm Institute from so many parts of the country. Because of the position of leadership the United States now has in world affairs, foreign policy is of vital and immediate concern to all of the American people. Not only do the larger issues of war or peace affect the lives of everyone in this country, but every individual is affected to some degree in his business affairs and personal life by conditions in the world at large. It is now clear to us all that our security and prosperity in this country depend in large measure on the degree of security and prosperity prevalent in other areas of the world. President Roosevelt said that "poverty anywhere constitutes danger to prosperity everywhere." And one can add that fear of aggression anywhere constitutes danger to peace everywhere. Therefore, it is in the interest of every American citizen to understand and to help shape the policies by which this Government may promote world conditions favorable to the preservation of our free institutions and the continued well-being of ourselves and our children. For this reason particularly I am glad to have this chance to discuss with you some of the important aspects of foreign policy with which our Government is now concerned and on which we need to have your considered views.

I have been asked to speak on the subject, The United States Goal in Tomorrow's World. The United States certainly has a goal in tomorrow's world. That goal is described in President Truman's inaugural address. The President set forth a four-point program with which we are all generally familiar. The four points in that program include: first, support of the United Nations; second, continuation of our programs for world economic recovery; third, strengthening the freedom-loving nations against the dangers of aggression; and fourth, "a bold new program for making the benefits of our scientific advances and industrial progress available for the improvement and growth of underdeveloped areas."

Tonight I want to talk particularly about the first and third points; that is, the support for the United Nations and the strengthening of freedom-loving nations against the dangers of aggression.

Before dealing with these points in detail, however, I should like to touch on the philosophy underlying this program which was expressed by a distinguished American Secretary of State, Elihu Root, who wrote in 1905:

"I observe that there are two entirely different theories according to which individual men seek to get on in the world. One theory leads a man to pull down everybody around him in order to climb up on them to a higher place. The other leads a man to help everybody around him in order that he may go up with them."

Secretary Root applied that second theory to American foreign policy. The same theory underlies in our foreign policy today. Hitler followed the opposite theory. Let me repeat to you the first point in President Truman's "program for peace and freedom."

"We will continue to give unfaltering support to the United Nations and related agencies, and we will continue to search for ways to strengthen their authority and increase their effectiveness. We believe that the United Nations will be strengthened by the new nations which are being formed in lands now advancing toward self-government under democratic principles."

I think there is still some lack of understanding of the United Nations in this country and out of this lack of understanding comes the feeling of discouragement with its progress. The situation is best described by recalling a change in the attitude which occurred with surprising suddenness after 1945. When the Charter of the United Nations was signed at San Francisco on June 26, 1945, the general comment of the delegates from

¹ Address made before the 11th Annual National Farm Institute in Des Moines, Iowa, on Feb. 18, 1949, and released to the press by the U. S. Mission to the United Nations on the same date.

the 51 countries who took part in this great task of drafting a constitution for a world organization, was a realistic comment. What was being said then was that we must not set our hopes too high. Most of the delegates who were at San Francisco were representatives of countries who had taken part in the old League of Nations. When the League was formed after World War I people felt that it was the ultimate answer and that war was now eliminated from the world. They soon found that they were wrong. The League did not succeed in its 19 years of existence in preventing war. When the United Nations was set up in 1945, people were conscious of the experience of the League of Nations. They said this is not a panacea for all of our ills, but it is a step in the right direction. They did not expect the United Nations to accomplish miracles and they knew that only a miracle could eliminate war overnight. The general comment in the United States was along the same lines. However, very soon that caution and realistic attitude were forgotten. People were desperately eager for the tension of the war period to cease and for a firm peace to be established. They began to feel that the United Nations had failed because it had not brought about the millennium. The United Nations is still less than four years old. It is an infant organization. If we stop and reexamine its real nature, I think we come to the conclusion that it is not a failure but that on the contrary it is doing its real job and doing it well.

The real job of the United Nations, as I see it, is to provide a way of doing business—a way of carrying on international affairs. In earlier times we carried on our international relations by having individual negotiations with all of the various countries involved. Under modern conditions, where international relations touch every aspect of our life, farming, manufacturing, trade, education, science, and everything else—we need an additional method. That method is international organization. We Americans did not have the League of Nations experience with this method of which many other nations had, but in a smaller field we had used it in our Pan-American relations and used it successfully.

Nowadays, it seems to me fantastic to suppose that the world will ever abandon the modern technique of international organization with its various international conferences, its permanent sec-

retariats, and all the machinery which is required for so complicated and widespread a business. But at the same time there is much to be done through diplomatic channels. Most of the members of the United Nations have permanent representatives at Lake Success, as we do. But at the same time we all maintain our embassies or legations in each others' capitals. Our ambassadors and ministers abroad and the like representatives of other Governments in Washington, are still busy and will continue to be so no matter how many group meetings we have. Some of the international problems handled through the embassies and legations are routine ones involving bilateral relations. Some have to do with carrying out decisions or recommendations of United Nations organs. Some involve preparation for United Nations meetings. There is nothing underhanded or surreptitious in such discussions. They are part and parcel of normal diplomatic relations. At times it is convenient to discuss a question with another representative on the Security Council or on the Economic and Social Council or the Trusteeship Council or some United Nations Commission at Lake Success. At other times it is useful to hold conversations in the Department of State or in the Foreign Office of the other country.

As a matter of fact the Charter of the United Nations, in article 33, encourages and indeed requires the full use of the processes of negotiation and the other peaceful means even when dangerous disputes are brewing. That is why, for example, the Berlin question was first discussed in Moscow before the three Western Governments took it to the Security Council of the United Nations.

The annual meetings of the General Assembly of the United Nations have a double aspect. The central feature of them is that they are "town meetings of the world" in which representatives of 58 countries can state publicly what they think on current issues. It is however natural, inevitable, and highly desirable that the secretaries of state and foreign ministers, and other high ranking officials who gather at these meetings, should take advantage of the occasions to talk together privately about matters of common concern. No one would suppose that they would confine their exchanges of views to the public platform. Of course they meet together in between meetings and the opportunity which this affords for personal con-

tact and personal acquaintance is one of the very valuable aspects of the United Nations method of carrying on international affairs.

One specific group negotiation is now widely discussed in the press and on the radio. I refer to the negotiations for a North Atlantic pact. You may have gotten the idea that the negotiation of this pact is inconsistent with our basic policy of working through the United Nations. If you do have this idea I can assure you it is not the idea of those who are carrying on the negotiations.

The North Atlantic pact does not by-pass the United Nations. It is not a substitute for the United Nations. It will not weaken the United Nations.

If we did not intend to work through the United Nations, we could boycott the Interim Committee or "Little Assembly." The Soviet Union has boycotted this committee which was set up by the General Assembly to study ways in which the United Nations can more effectively keep the peace.

If we did not intend to work through the United Nations, we could have acted alone in Korea. Instead we took the matter to the United Nations, helped a United Nations Commission supervise elections in our zone and recognized the Korean Government only after the United Nations General Assembly had adopted a resolution which acknowledged that this was a proper thing to do. The Soviet Union would not let the Ukraine accept a place on the Korean Commission. It would not let the Commission operate in the Soviet-occupation zone. It supports a puppet Government in the northern part of Korea. Three days ago in the Security Council, the Soviet Representative was repeating all their old arguments about Korea, in total disregard of the resolutions adopted by the General Assembly. As you listen to some of their long speeches it sounds as if they took as gospel the old song which said "Wishing Will Make It So."

If we did not intend to work through the United Nations, we would not have taken the Berlin case to the Security Council. The Soviet Union refused to admit that the United Nations, or any organ of it, could deal with the case. When the Security Council discussed the question, Vyshinsky sat in sulky silence. When the Security Council voted, Vyshinsky vetoed.

We, the United States, cooperate in all the 13 specialized agencies of the United Nations. The

Soviet Union joined only three of them; and this week, I regret to say, the Soviet Union withdrew from one of those three—the World Health Organization.

Look at the records of United Nations meetings—General Assembly, Security Council, Economic and Social Council, Trusteeship Council, Commissions and Committees—dealing with atomic energy, disarmament, the struggle for human rights, the struggle for peace in Indonesia, for peace in Palestine, for peace in Kashmir, for peace in the Balkans, and many other subjects, and you will find the proofs of United States cooperation in the work of the United Nations. The record is long, our record is good. No American need be ashamed of the record. Every American should be proud of it.

I do not mean that every American citizen will agree with every decision which has been taken during these last three years. Our Government is made up of human beings. It is not infallible. Maybe it has made mistakes. Maybe it will make other mistakes. Maybe some of the things you or someone else think were mistakes were actually sound, wise decisions. We are a country with many varied interests and we have citizens with many different national backgrounds. Often in our history these differences have been reflected in disagreements on foreign policy. In my own short experience in Government, I have seen many examples of this. But we don't want in this country the unitary thinking which follows a party line like a needle on a record. We think our own thoughts and reach our own conclusions. Your representatives handling our foreign relations have to consider a great number of points in every case. They have the responsibility—the very grave responsibility—of making decisions. Again, looking at the record, I do not hesitate to give my own opinion that it is a good record.

Well, you may say, the past record is good but have we changed? Has the attitude of the Soviet Union poisoned our policy? Have they succeeded in wrecking the United Nations? Flatly and categorically my answer is "No". I quote again the first of the four major courses of action laid down in President Truman's program for peace and freedom:

"We will continue to give unfaltering support to the United Nations and related agencies, and

February 27, 1949

[3] 245

we will continue to search for ways to strengthen their authority and increase their effectiveness."

At the same time I do not hesitate to say that the attitude of the Soviet Union is making it more difficult for the United Nations to do its job. The U.S.S.R. has not yet begun to cooperate with the United Nations. Behind its Iron Curtain it is manufacturing fear. Out in the open we along with fifty-two other countries are building peace. Make no mistake about it, we are going to win. But it is not going to be an easy job or a short one. Peace is not merely the end of a war. Peace has to be made and it also has to be kept. Nobody in the democratic world can ever be unemployed if he or she works for peace. You can work on it full time or part time—as a government official or as a private citizen. But we can't just sit around under a tree and expect peace to drop in our lap like a ripe piece of fruit. The U.N. Poster says: "Peace takes practice." That's true.

One result of the Soviet attitude and policy has been to create and maintain a state of tension. That state of tension is, of course, greatest in those parts of the world which are closest to the Soviet Union and the Red Army. It is an incontestable and striking fact that in the United Nations General Assembly in Paris, the other countries of the world distrusted Soviet armaments and took comfort in American armaments. In the votes on resolutions dealing with atomic energy and disarmament they showed that this is the way they feel. We deserve that confidence because we have no aggressive intent. We must and we shall continue to deserve it. The Russians can't expect others to trust them so long as they hide behind the Iron Curtain and nourish the aggressive and deceitful hostility which Communism teaches.

In Western Europe the countries overrun by the war have two vital and inescapable needs. They need economic revival and they need the feeling of security and hope without which a man can't put his heart into his work. As was said at lunch today, security is a feeling inside you. Through the Marshall Plan we are helping the economic revival. Through the United Nations and the proposed North Atlantic pact we are creating the feeling of security and hope.

Because of the Soviet attitude, the necessary feeling of security has not come from the bare

existence of the Security Council of the United Nations. But while the Charter of the United Nations says in article 24 that the Security Council has primary responsibility for international peace and security, it does not give it *sole* responsibility. That responsibility is shared by all the Members. The Charter, in article 51, authorizes Members to act in self-defense. Chapter VIII of the Charter authorizes them to form regional organizations. These are supplementary methods for maintaining international peace and security and they are methods within the structure of the United Nations.

I again quote the third point of the President's four-point program: "We will strengthen the freedom-loving nations against the dangers of aggression."

In 1947 we signed the Rio pact which relies on these supplementary methods for the Americas. A North Atlantic pact would also rely on article 51 of the Charter which expressly recognizes "the inherent right of individual or collective self-defense". By providing in advance for collective self-defense, this pact would decrease the likelihood that such measures will ever need be taken. If the activities of the states which sign such a pact fall within the provisions of chapter VIII of the Charter, they will be governed by those provisions. This will be true regardless of what the exact text of such a pact may be. This is true because article 103 of the Charter says that if there is any conflict between the obligations of a member of the United Nations under the Charter and its obligations under any other international agreement, the "obligations under the present Charter shall prevail". We are bound not to make a treaty which would set aside the Charter. We do not want to make such a treaty even if we could. "We will continue to give unfaltering support to the United Nations". We shall not cease to develop the universal approach to international peace and freedom but obstacles placed in the way of its rapid development will not deter us from uniting with other like-minded nations in developing simultaneously other approaches which the Charter allows.

If we look back at the recent record preceding the current discussions of a North Atlantic pact, we see all the more clearly how it fits in with the United Nations system. The general problem of groups of states uniting for the preservation of peace was discussed by Secretary of State Marshall

before the House Foreign Affairs Committee on May 4, 1948. At that time, he referred to the Rio pact and to the Western Union pact in Europe. He noted that "our intention to afford encouragement and support of arrangements made by free nations for the preservation of their independence and liberty" had already been stated by the President in his message to the Congress on March 17, 1947.

On June 11, 1948, by a vote of 64 to 4 the Senate adopted the Vandenberg resolution. This resolution, like the President's four-point program, begins with an affirmation of our support of the United Nations. It then goes on to reaffirm the policy of the United States to pursue particularly the following objectives among others:

"Progressive development of regional and other collective arrangements for individual and collective self-defense in accordance with the purposes, principles, and provisions of the Charter.

"Association of the United States, by constitutional process, with such regional and other collective arrangements as are based on continuous and effective self-help and mutual aid, and as affect its national security.

"Contributing to the maintenance of peace by making clear its determination to exercise the right of individual or collective self-defense under article 51 should any armed attack occur affecting its national security."

Thus, the present stage of our discussion of a North Atlantic pact follows the lines of policy recommended by the Senate and previously referred to by the President and by Secretary Marshall.

We can and do welcome every step which brings groups of nations closer together for the purpose of promoting peace. With our good neighbors in this hemisphere we have developed the Pan American Union. Our relations with Canada are of the best and Canada is again a partner in negotiating the North Atlantic pact. Over many years opinion in this country has favored the idea of European union. Great strides are being made in our day toward such union. We now know that we are not separated from Western Europe by the North Atlantic. That ocean and the airspace above it join us to Western Europe. In the Norwegian Parliament two weeks ago, Foreign Minis-

ter Lange answered a Communist member who scathingly declared that it was curious to talk about "regional cooperation" across the Atlantic. Mr. Lange said: "The people of Norway know that an ocean connects, not separates. Therefore, it is natural to try getting in touch with a people with whom we share opinions in the dignity of the human being, faith in our privilege to say and think whatever we want, faith in real democracy".

It would not be appropriate for me to comment on the Norwegian Foreign Minister's discussions recently during his visit to Washington. I quote his statement merely to show how our minds meet across the Atlantic.

The more the countries of Western Europe work with each other the better can they work with us and other Members of the United Nations. The United Nations spans the whole world. I agree it is already one world but it is not yet a world union. There are many people who urge that we should have world government now. I cannot discuss that whole question this evening but I should like to say that we cannot get world government overnight any more than we can get permanent world peace overnight. What we have done and are doing is to join in a process of bringing the nations of the world closer together—in the United Nations itself and in groups of states which have common interests. So long as the smaller groups operate within the United Nations, inspired by its purposes and principles, we are moving forward. I don't believe any of us here want to move in any other direction. We may disagree among ourselves from time to time on the best road to take—thank God we live in a country where we are free to disagree—but I think we will always agree on the objective which is peace and freedom.

Some people want to take a short cut to peace. They don't want to start from where we are, but we are in a world of sovereign states groping their way to better international organization. The world of ours does include the Soviet Union and hundreds of millions of other people who haven't our traditions or advantages or ways of thinking. We have to start from that situation.

In seeking our objective we will cooperate with every other country which is willing to act in accordance with the purposes and principles of the United Nations. That includes the Soviet Union. We do not want any country to underesti-

February 27, 1949

[5] 247

mate the seriousness with which we intend to support the peace system for which the United Nations stands. That too includes the Soviet Union.

"The primary purpose of these agreements", said President Truman referring to the Rio and North Atlantic pacts, "is to provide unmistakable proof of the joint determination of the free countries to resist armed attack from any quarter. Each country participating in these arrangements must contribute all it can to the common defense.

"If we can make it sufficiently clear, in advance, that any armed attack affecting our national se-

curity would be met with overwhelming force, the armed attack might never occur."

It would also be a great mistake for the Soviet Union or any other country to think that we are hoeing a lone row. We are using modern international machinery to harvest the most important crop in the world and there are more than fifty nations helping us. Any other country that wishes to join in the job is welcome. If they join with the rest of us, they will have the same satisfaction in looking in their pay envelopes and finding each week, each month, each year that peace pays and that it pays to work for it.

FE/P

MAR 30 12 13 PM '49
LW/E

February 27, 1949

[6]

251